

REMARKS

Claims 2-5, 7-9 and 13-18 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims are rejected. Claims 2, 13 and 18 are currently amended. Reconsideration and further examination are requested.

Claims 2, 3, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 7,260,392. In the “response to arguments” the Examiner states:

Applicant argues that Kitchin does not teach checking selected number of previously received packets and the packets differ for at least two quality of service levels. Kitchin teaches maintaining separate duplication cache for each of the different class of packets. This cache limits the packets to selected number of previously received packets since this cache is finite and has a maximum limit of how many packets can be stored in the cache.

With all due respect, that is not the limitation that was being argued as a distinction. What was argued was that the “selected number of previously received packets” used for comparison differs between two service levels. As described in the specification at page 11, lines 5-6, PHBs of lower priority may have smaller anti-replay windows than those with higher priority. It will be appreciated that anti-replay mechanisms requires resources such as memory and CPU cycles, and the extent of resources required is at least in-part a function of the number of packets included in the comparison. The presently claimed invention allows utilization of fewer resources for some service levels than others by comparing different numbers of packet sequence numbers for different service levels. This can be accomplished by establishing separate look-back windows of different sizes for different service levels. For example, one might use a short window for a low priority level, thereby occupying relatively few resources and theoretically increasing exposure to attacks. Similarly, one might use a longer window for a higher priority level, thereby

occupying relatively more resources and theoretically decreasing exposure to attacks. Such motivations are intended only as examples, and not to limit the claims. The distinguishing point recited in the claims on which the Examiner is requested to focus is that the number of sequence numbers compared differs between two quality of service levels, e.g., because the size of the look-back window for a first service level is different than the size of the look-back window for a second service level. Although this distinguishing feature was already recited in independent claims 2, 13 and 18, those claims are currently amended to include additional emphasis. The dependent claims further define the invention, and are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections is therefore requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. For these reasons, and in view of the previous amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

March 9, 2009
Date

/Holmew W. Anderson/
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Anderson Gorecki & Manaras LLP
33 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 120-038
Dd: 01/20/2009